



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Light of the Homeric Scholia, pp. 51-55, J. H. U. thesis, Baltimore, 1895).

Finally, under the third postulate that poetry as a distinct art has a correctness of its own, Bywater finds only one λύσις, whereas there are two, illustrated by examples, namely, (XI) the End of Poetry (τὸ τέλος, 1460 b 23), and (XII) the Accidental (πρὸς συμβεβηκός, 1460 b 29-32) in explanation of technical inaccuracies as regards other arts and sciences. Thus the grouping is (3 + 7 + 2), not (5 + 6 + 1) as Bywater puts it.

The volume concludes with an Appendix giving a synopsis of versions and paraphrases of the clause about the *Calharsis*, an Index of Greek Words and an Index to the Commentary.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

TWO STUDIES IN NOUN SUFFIXES.

Greek Diminutives in *-ιον*. A Study in Semantics. By WALTER PETERSEN, PH. D., Professor of Greek in Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas. Weimar, 1910.

The Suffixes *-mant* and *-vant* in Sanskrit and Avestan. By HAROLD H. BENDER, PH. D., Instructor in Modern Languages in Princeton University. Johns Hopkins Dissertation: Baltimore, 1910.

Two different points of view in the scholarly investigation of noun suffixes are represented by these works. Dr. Petersen's title plainly states that his primary interest lies in the semantic development of his suffixes, and he has little to say about phonetics. Dr. Bender, on the other hand, devotes only 25 out of the 99 pages of the descriptive part of his text to semantics; the rest deals with the phonetic correlation of his suffixes and their euphonic combination with word bases. This is, however, no reflection on the scholarship of either author; the reason lies rather in the facts of the case. The semantic uses of the suffixes *mant* and *vant* are not particularly varied or interesting, while the phonetic questions connected with them deserve, as Bender shows, very close study. On the other hand, whatever phonetic interest there may be in the Greek *-ιον* suffixes is entirely overshadowed by their very complicated and interesting semantics.

Bender's work of 116 large pages is divided into two parts, the larger section dealing with the Sanskrit language, the smaller with the Avestan. He has found 2200 words in Vedic and Classical Sanskrit ending in *mant* and *vant*; of these 1748 have *vant*

and 452 *mant*. The proportion of *mant* to *vant* words is slightly larger in the RV., but from AV. on it is about as in Classical Sanskrit, viz. 1 : 4. The complicated question of the choice between the suffixes, i. e., in what cases *mant* was used and in what cases *vant*, has remained in a state of hopeless confusion, in spite of the efforts of Pāṇini and Benfey to straighten it out. It has remained for Bender successfully to accomplish the task. By a comparison of the state of things in the Avesta, the Veda, and the later Sanskrit he shows that it depends on the vowel of the syllable before the suffix, in the following way :

1) In Indo-Iranian, as in Avestan, *mant* was used after an *u*-vowel, or a consonant immediately preceded by an *u*-vowel ; other stems took *vant*.

2) In the early parts of the Veda *vant* is still used after *ā*-stems (or those in which *ā* preceded a final consonant), but other vowels (that is the *i*-vowels and *r*) have begun to go over to *mant*, which predominates with all except *ī*. The *u*-vowels still keep to *mant*.

3) In later Sanskrit *mant* has gained the field almost to the exclusion of *vant*, in the case of other vowels than *ā*,—except that, curiously, *ī* still continues to take *vant* in a majority of cases. (The total number of cases with *ī* is, however, comparatively small.)

The number of exceptions is not inconsiderable, but B. is in general successful in explaining them as due to analogy, to parallel word-forms in different vowels, to word or line cadence or the like.

Chapter II deals with the *saṁdhi* of *mant* and *vant*, a very troublesome subject. Not only are the rules of external (instead of internal) combination used in many cases (p. 43 ff.), but there are also many 'lengthenings' and 'shortenings', and even 'omissions' and 'insertions' of final stem vowels. Personally I should substitute 'appear to be' for 'are' in all these cases, without exception ; I confess to more skepsis than the author seems to show. And when it comes to 'dropping' and 'inserting' final *consonants*, this skepsis increases. Surely such cases (they are of course very rare) must be purely analogical, except in so far as the 'dropping' of an *n* is concerned ; this is of course, as Bender remarks, really no dropping, but the use of a weaker form of the stem (*açma-vant*, cf. *açman-vant*). B. indeed also calls attention to considerations of analogy, metrical cadence, etc., as being at least occasionally the cause of such phenomena. Especially interesting is his note that before the fem. form (*vatī*) of the suffix a long vowel is particularly common ; he thinks this may be due to metrical cadence. May it not also have something to do with the adjectival and nominal fem. endings *ā* and *ī* ?

Chapter III deals with the meanings of the suffixes arranged in order of their frequency of occurrence. A number of examples are given under each head ; there would have been some

advantage in giving exhaustive lists here, but it seemed better to the author to give his complete lists in phonetic divisions instead. The simplest and most primitive meaning of the suffixes ('possessing, having') prevails, Bender finds, in 60% of the cases. Next in order of frequency are the words having the force of present participles (7—10%). The arrangement of the groups in descending arithmetical progression necessarily separates related groups; the author however undertakes to supply this deficiency by a section in which he treats briefly of these relationships, with an illustrative diagram. I suppose no one would ever be quite satisfied with another's arrangement of such delicate things as these shades of semantic variation; and I know from personal experience the difficulty of such arrangements. Bender makes 19 semantic divisions, besides a twentieth which includes nine scattering and miscellaneous subheads. Some of these divisions seem based on rather trifling differences of meaning, and it might have been well to use a much smaller number of groups, and to arrange them so as to bring out more clearly their interrelationships.

Part II, dealing with the Avesta, is naturally much shorter, since there are only 190 words (168 in *vant*, 22 in *mant*) which are found. It follows closely in detail the treatment of the Sanskrit suffixes. Interesting is the table (pp. 86—7) of identical words appearing in both Sanskrit and Avestan. Except for the difference in phonetic treatment mentioned above, the Av. brings out little or nothing additional. Its use of the suffixes reveals much narrower semantic limits.

Bender's work is a most valuable contribution to Aryan philology, and is in fact the first serious study that has been made of any Sanskrit suffix on a basis of modern philological scholarship. Its phonetic treatment (which is in this case of overwhelming importance) is especially admirable; I think no doubt will remain in the minds of scholars that he has proved his case as to the relation between the suffixes *mant* and *vant*.

It would take much more space than I have at my disposal to touch adequately upon even the more important of the many interesting problems dealt with in the compressed richness of Dr. Petersen's book of 300 pages. My remarks on it will necessarily be largely eclectic. The subject is a large one, much larger in fact than the rather modest title would indicate; as a matter of fact Petersen takes up in a pretty systematic way the whole of the *-iov* suffix in Classical Greek, and by no means limits himself to semantic considerations, altho they are his main interest. He is commendably generous in his citations of examples, with full passages, under each of his headings, and in the case of the more important semantic divisions his lists claim and appear to be quite exhaustive for Classical Greek. It is perhaps to be regretted that he did not find some way of recording

systematically *every* -ιον word known to occur, with proper classification; and altho that would have swelled the proportions of the already bulky work, it would have given a touch of completeness and finality to it, and would have also helped other investigators who might wish to look into the suffix for themselves.

P. deals briefly, but, it seems, satisfactorily, with (Ch. II) the euphonic combination of -ιο- with various stem-finals, and (Ch. III) the accent of -ιον nouns, of which he finds that Chandler's and Allinson's rules will not hold. With Ch. V (p. 15) begins the semantic discussion. In this chapter the author deals with abstract nouns with verbal force; in the next, with abstracts 'expressing an attribute or state', from adjectives. It would seem to me unlikely that the mere fact of these words being used often, or even exclusively, as abstracts justifies their complete separation from the similar nouns which are only found as concretes. Thus, συνέδριον, <συνέδρα, because it means 'council' as well as 'council chamber', is put here; but καταγώγιον, <καταγωγή, he puts among place names containing -ιον as a 'suffix of appurtenance', twenty pages farther on. But whether the concrete or the abstract meaning of συνέδριον was more primary, surely the suffix must have been as much a suffix of appurtenance here as with καταγώγιον. The two manifestly belong together. And even when a word is found only as an abstract, I see no ground for such a separation. These abstracts might better be made a subhead of the regular suffix of appurtenance. The abstract meaning was probably secondary as a class, tho not in every single word.

In Ch. VIII P. treats -ιον as a 'suffix of appurtenance', meaning 'belonging to' or 'connected with'. He regards this as the starting point for all the following groups, viz. -ιον meaning 'coming from' (Ch. IX), meaning 'made of' or 'consisting of' (Ch. X), as a suffix of possession (Ch. XI), meaning 'belonging to the category of, having the nature of' (Ch. XII), meaning 'that which is like, but not equivalent to the primitive' (Ch. XIII), as a deteriorative suffix (XIV), as a diminutive suffix (XV), and as a hypocoristic suffix (XVI). It is now and then a little hard to follow his reasoning. Perhaps it would be better not to try to derive all these meanings from one original, in the case of -ιον. The reviewer was confronted with an almost identical collection of meanings in the Vedic suffix -ka (see his forthcoming article in JAOS Vol. 31), but here the way to a right solution was made plain by the language itself; the oldest Vedic knows ka practically only in the sense 'having the nature of', 'similar to', and in the diminutive-pejorative uses, which (as P. rightly shows also for -ιον) are secondary to that. Accordingly, the suffix ka, at least, must have developed the meanings of possession and appurtenance, which it has later, thru the meanings 'having the characteristics of', 'characterized by', 'related to'. This line of development is easily conceivable for the suffix -ιον also.

But these matters are both highly subjective and of little real importance in comparison with the admirably clear, thorough and illuminating way in which each of the individual semantic divisions is treated by P. The very numerous words under the heading 'appertaining to', etc., are quite properly divided into groups of words with related meanings: place names, plant names, instrument nouns, names of vessels and utensils, etc. The meaning 'coming from', including the patronymics, P. rightly derives from the appurtenance idea, but names for the young of animals [*ὀρνίθιον*, etc.] would better be regarded as diminutives. The meaning 'made of', 'consisting of', he finds rare in the adjectival form (-*ιος*), it being supplanted by -*ειος* and -*ινος*; but the neut. -*ιον* is common. As a suffix of possession the suffix is rare. I should derive this from the suffix of likeness and characteristic; *αστέριος* 'characterized by stars'; *κόμιος* 'that of which dust is a prominent characteristic, which suggests dust', and so 'having dust'. So with the next category, meaning 'having the nature of, characterized by'; it is, I think, more apt to precede than to follow the idea 'belonging to', and the idea 'being like' is older than the idea 'belonging to the category of'. The words in this class are of two kinds, according as they are of generalizing (*τὰ ἀράχνια*—the members of the genus 'spider') or of specializing meaning; the 'specializing' variety came to be used almost without distinction from the primitive. The author recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing these words (e. g. *ζώνιον*: *ζώνη*) from diminutives; and I should suspect such force in all names of ornaments, small garments, etc., which P. has classed here.—Close to this comes the next division, where -*ιον* has the meaning 'like (but not equal to)', a fairly numerous class, which serves as a starting point for the deteriorative, diminutive and hypocoristic uses.

Of these, P. is willing to derive the hypocoristic from the diminutive (of size), but vigorously protests against making the deteriorative secondary to the diminutive, or vice-versa. Both, he thinks, are more apt to come independently from the suffix of likeness. I agree with him in this, and have carried out the same thought in my thesis on the Sanskrit *ka*-words; but it did not seem necessary to me to emphasize the fact, and it seems to me that Petersen exaggerates its importance. For after all, all these ideas are very closely related; approximate likeness with failure of perfect identity suggests inferiority, smallness, delicacy, etc., all more or less at once; a suffix which had the first meaning could hardly avoid taking on the others, and even the same word, formed with such a suffix, may and often does appear with different 'diminutive' values in different contexts. P. himself must recognize that the diminutive and pejorative values belong closely together, since he groups them as 'diminutives' (to be sure, always quoting the word) in discussing the time of their

origin (Ch. XVIII). In detail, his account of these groups is instructive, and his collection of examples exhaustive and valuable.

Ch. XVIII, on the time of origin of the 'diminutive' uses, is excellent. He shows, successfully as I think, that the claim of diminutive use for the IE. suffix *-io-*, raised by Brugmann and others, is quite unprovable. The diminutive use of *-ioν* in Greek he believes to be later than the epic, and even than the early elegiac and melic poets, whose fragments do not show it. To be sure, Petersen seems to me to overemphasize the absence of diminutive *-ioν* in Homer; Homer avoids diminutives altogether, tho some such suffixes must certainly have existed in his time. The most elevated style eschews even 'faded' diminutives, P. to the contrary notwithstanding. P. quotes the German Mädchen, and thinks no German poet 'would care, or even be able to avoid' the use of it, 'no matter how elevated his style'. But the fact is, German poets in their elevated moments *do* avoid it. In the text of Wagner's Walküre it is used only once (and there consciously, with studied effect), while the poetic 'Maid' occurs 22 times—if my hasty count is correct. Moreover I did not notice a single other occurrence of *-chen* or *-lein* in the play. The use of diminutives by Lucretius (p. 199) does not argue against this; for Lucretius was a philosopher, and the diminutives are a sign of his philosopher's pose,—his contempt for the so-called insignificance of earthly affairs. The same theory is especially noticeable in the writings of the Stoic philosophers, e. g., in the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius, as Professor Gildersleeve has reminded me; nor is the use limited to them. On the general stylistic value of diminutives, see Peppler, *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes*, Baltimore, 1902.—Nevertheless, I think Petersen shows pretty clearly that there is at least no positive reason for thinking that the diminutive use of *-ioν* antedates post-Homeric Greek.

The last twelve chapters of the work deal with compound suffixes containing *-ioν*. Their origin, by 'clipping' from words in which *-ioν* was added to another stem, is fully and satisfactorily treated. The following suffixes are treated: *-διον* or *-ιδιον*, whose meanings he finds almost as varied as the simple *-ioν*; *-αδιον*, mostly late and of heterogeneous origin, also widely varying in meaning (only one-third of the words are diminutive); *-υδριον*, most frequently deteriorative in classical times; *-ακιον* (only a few scattering examples in classical Greek, not exclusively diminutive); *-ισκιον*, cf. *-ισκος*, generally diminutive; *-αλ(λ)ιον* and *-ελ(λ)ιον*, the former being found in two or three diminutives, the latter probably not really existing; *-υλλιον*, prevailingly deteriorative; *-ῶνιον* only in *στηθύιον*, endearing diminutive; *-(δ)αριον*, most commonly diminutive; **-υριον*, wrongly set up by Schwabe as an independent suffix; *-ασιον* < IE. *-t(i)ion*, rarely diminutive; *-αφιον*, *-ηφιον*, *-ιφιον* and *-υφιον* (the first being the commonest), prevailingly diminutive.

Again I must give expression to my deep sense of the impossibility of doing justice to Dr. Petersen's very scholarly and admirable work in such a limited review. Perhaps no one who does not know by experience the laboriousness of this kind of suffix study could fully appreciate the enormous amount of industry, thought and care which the author has put into his subject, and the results of which show on every page. Tho one may be allowed to differ with him now and then on more or less abstract questions of derivation of meanings, this does not in any way detract from the value of the rich collections of material or the careful sifting of them.

(NOTE.—On p. 110 Petersen quotes Sanskrit *maryakā* as meaning 'manikin'. But the word means '*Männchen*' in the sense of 'male animal, bull', a wholly different idea. The Pet. Lex. gives this meaning, which some later interpreters have unwisely abandoned. See JAOS 31, part 2, p. 149.)

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.